M-S.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,306	02/07/2001	Marc Segre	RPS920000029US1	4556

7590 10/22/2002

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P O BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER
SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	5

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/779,306	SEGRE, MARC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonid Shapiro	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abraham et al. (US Patent No. 6,069,615).

As to claim 1, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems operating utilizing a single set of input devices with: a single set of input devices including a pointing device (See Fig. 1, items 24, 26, in description See Col. 1, Lines 37-41 and Col. 2, Lines 14-16); at least two data processing systems sharing the single set of input devices, each data processing system having a logical display area logically arranged to have at least one boundary in common with the display area for another data processing system, wherein a pointer driven cursor controlled by the pointing device is located within a display area for an active data processing system receiving input signals from the single set of input devices (See Fig. 2, items 12, 14, 24, 26 in

description See Col. 2, Lines 32-41); switching means, responsive to movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary between two display areas, for automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Fig. 1, 2, items 12, 14, 24, 26 in description See Col. 2, Lines 3-67 and Col. 2, Lines 1-17).

As to claim 7, Abraham et al. teaches a method operating multiple data processing systems using a single set of input devices (See Fig. 1, items 24, 26, in description See Col. 1, Lines 37-41 and Col. 2, Lines 14-16), with receiving signals from a pointing device within the single set of input devices controlling movement of a cursor within a display area for an active data processing system receiving input signals from the single set of input devices (See Fig. 2, items 12, 14, 24, 26 in description See Col. 2, Lines 32-41); responsive to movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary between two logical display areas, each logical display area corresponding to a different data processing system, automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Fig. 1, 2, items 12, 14, 24, 26 in description See Col. 2, Lines 3-67 and Col. 2, Lines 1-17).

As to claim 15, Abraham et al. teaches an automatic input switching device with:

An input controller; an input connection within the input controller for a single set of input devices including a pointing device; output connections within the input controller for at least two data processing systems; switching logic within the input controller at least two data processing systems transmitting input signals from the single set of input devices to an active data processing system (See Fig. 1-3, items 28, 30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 27-62); wherein the switching logic, responsive to movement of the cursor within the display area of the active data processing system past a logical common boundary between two logical display areas, each logical display area corresponding to a different data processing system, automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Fig. 1, 2, items 12, 14, 24, 26 in description See Col. 2, Lines 3-67 and Col. 2, Lines 1-17).

As to claim 2, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the at least two data processing systems with an array of data processing system displays, each data processing system display corresponding to a different data processing system having a logical display area (See Fig. 1, items 12, 14, 16, a-e, in description See Col. 1, Lines 7-10).

As to claim 3, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the switching means further comprises a universal serial bus connection of the single set of input devices to each data processing system (See Fig.2-3, item 28, in description See Col. 3, Lines 41-49).

As to claim 4, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the switching means further comprises a input controller connecting the single set of input devices to each data processing system, wherein the active data processing system signals the input controller to switch transmission of input signals upon detecting movement of the cursor across the logical common boundary shared by the display area for the active data processing system and the display area for the other data processing system (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14 , 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 5, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the switching means further comprises a input controller connecting the single set of input devices to each data processing system, the input controller configured to identify logical common boundaries between logical display areas and calibrated with respect to each logical display area and signals generated by pointing device, wherein the input controller switches transmission of input signals upon detecting movement of the cursor across the logical common boundary shared by the display area for the active data processing system and the display area for the other data processing system (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14 , 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 16-67).

As to claim 6, Abraham et al. teaches a set of data processing systems with a logical arrangement of display areas for at least two data processing systems which corresponds to a physical configuration of display devices for the at least two data processing systems, wherein logical display areas for data processing systems having physically adjacent display devices share a logical common boundary (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, c, b, d, in description See Col. 2, Lines 32-49).

As to claim 8, Abraham et al. teaches a method with receiving signals from the single set through an input controller switching transmission of the signals between data processing systems ((See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 9, Abraham et al. teaches a method with connecting the data processing systems to the input controller utilizing a universal serial bus (See Fig.2-3, item 28, in description See Col. 3, Lines 41-49).

As to claim 10, Abraham et al. teaches the method, wherein the step of automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system with switching transmission of the signals between data processing systems based upon an arrangement of logical display area for data processing systems and calibration within the input controller of each logical display area and signals generated by pointing device (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14 , 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 11, Abraham et al. teaches the method, wherein the step of automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system with switching transmission of the signals between data processing systems in response to a signal received within the input controller from the active data processing system ((See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14 , 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 12, Abraham et al. teaches the method, wherein the step of automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the logical common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system with switching transmission of the signals between data processing systems in response to a signal received from the active data processing system (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14 , 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 13, Abraham et al. teaches a method with a logical arrangement of display areas for the data processing systems to correspond to a physical configuration of display devices for the data processing systems, wherein logical display areas for data processing systems having physically adjacent display devices share a logical common boundary (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, c, b, d, in description See Col. 2, Lines 32-49).

As to claim 14, Abraham et al. teaches a method with arranging logical display areas for the data processing systems in an array of contiguous logical display areas (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, in description See Col. 2, Lines 39-44).

As to claim 16, Abraham et al. teaches the automatic input switching device, wherein the switching logic switches transmission of the input signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to the other data processing system in response to a signal received from the active data processing system (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 17, Abraham et al. teaches the automatic input switching device, wherein the switching logic switches transmission of the input signals from the single set of input devices

from the active data processing system to the other data processing system based upon arrangement of logical display areas for data processing systems and calibration of each logical display area and the pointing device (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, 28 in description see Col. 2, lines 32-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1-9).

As to claim 18, Abraham et al. teaches the automatic input switching device, wherein the output connections further comprise: output connections to a plurality of data processing systems each having a logical display area, wherein the logical display areas are arranged in a contiguous array corresponding to physical positions of display devices for the data processing systems, wherein display areas for data processing systems having adjacent display devices share a logical common boundary (See Fig. 1-2, items 12, 14, c, b, d, in description See Col. 2, Lines 32-49).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

The Hogle (Us Patent No. 5,923,307) reference discloses logical monitor configuration in a multiple monitor environment.

The Endres et al. (Us Patent No. 6,104,359) reference discloses allocating display information.

The Adler et al. (Us Patent No. 6,340,957 B1) reference discloses dynamically relocatable tileable displays.

The Bang et al. (Us Patent No. 5,956,019) reference discloses touch-pad cursor control device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

ls
October 4, 2002

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600